DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 230 892 CG 016 759

AUTHOR Adams, Rebecca G.
TITLE Emotional Closeness and Physical Distance between Friends: Implications for Elderly Women.
PUB DATE Nov 82
NOTE 44p.; Paper presented at the Annual Scientific Meeting of the Gerontological Society (35th, Boston, MA, November 19-23, 1983). Best copy available.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Distance; Emotional Adjustment; Emotional Response; *Females; *Friendship; Interpersonal Relationship; Interviews; *Older Adults; Peer Relationship; *Proximity; Psychological Patterns; *Social Support Groups; Well Being

ABSTRACT

A recent concern with the informal support systems of elderly people has focused on the ways in which the eldery live independently with the help of others, primarily the family. In order to explore the dimensions of social space (emotional closeness, and physical distance) as they relate to friendship, elderly, unmarried women (N=70) living in a suburban metropolitan area participated in tape recorded interviews. Data analyses indicated that, contrary to expectation, greater physical distance correlated positively with emotional closeness. In addition, duration of friendship correlated positively with emotional closeness, and frequency of interaction correlated positivley with proximity. Using Simmel's approach to the study of social relationships, the data were collapsed into four categories: (1) emotionally and physically close; (2) emotionally distant and physically close; (3) emotionally close and physically distant; and (4) emotionally and physically distant. Further analysis indicated that emotionally close, local friends were most likely to help the elderly individual and improve her psychological well-being. Since only 60% of the respondents had emotionally close, local friends, future research could focus on the importance of other types of friendships. (AG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED230892

Emotional Closeness and Physical Distance between Friends: Implications for Elderly Women

by Rebecca G. Adams*

*Phd. Candidate, Dept. of Sociology, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL. 60304

Prepared for Presentation at the 35th Annual Scientific Meeting of the Gerontological Society of America, Boston, Massachusetts, November 19-23, 1982

CG 016759

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Rebecca G. Adams

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Abstract

The author discusses the need for a better theoretical understanding of friendship if its role in the lives of elderly people is to be understood. The applicability to friendship of Simmel's approach to the study of social relationships is outlined. From this perspecitive, types of friendship are determined by the physical distance separating friends and the emotional closeness bringing them together. The data consist of seventy in-depth interviews of senior, unmarried women in Oak Park, a middle-class community bordering on Chicago. The women reported a total of 678 friendships. Qualitative data are reported to support quantitative analyses. There are positive relationships between emotional closeness and physical distance, duration and emotional closeness, and frequency of interaction and proximity. The author discusses the life cycle processes that contributed to these outcomes. The implications for elderly women of the tendency for their close, old friends to be physically separated from them and their neighbors to be casual friends, but constant companions, are discussed.

Introduction

Recently, there has been a concern with the informal support systems of elderly people. The focus of much of this literature has been on the ways in which elderly people, with the help of significant others, live independently. The vast majority of this research has focused exclusively on the elderly person's family. I consider this unfortunate in three respects. First, there is evidence that friends are part of the networks supporting older people (Hochschild 1973, Cantor 1979, Lopata 1979). Without a better understanding of the meaning of friendship in the lives of older people, we cannot hope to understand the natural systems in which they live.

Second, aging has been characterized as the process of the loss of choice (Goldman 1971). It seems that this makes friendship, which is theoretically voluntary, a potentially important activity for older people who may otherwise face dependence on agencies and family members not of their own choosing.

Third, as our society becomes more mobile, elderly people may be less likely to be entrenched in extended kinship networks. While now most elderly people have a child near by to help them and give them emotional support, a better understanding of the rewards associated with different types of friendship may be more important in the future.

Researchers have often used, for theoretical or practical reasons, an *a priori* definition of friendship or have otherwise limited the possible range of responses. For example, some researchers have studied only local friendships (Rosow 1967, Williams 1956, 1959) or friendships in which contact

was recent (Cohen and Rajkowski 1982, Rosenberg 1970, Dotson 1951). Other researchers have studied only the respondent's best or closest friends (Williams 1956,1959, Laumann 1973, Crowe 1978, Jacobson 1968).

In this paper, I study the variation other researchers have eliminated from consideration. I borrow my theoretical framework from Georg Simmel. Simmel viewed relationships as existing in social space. Two important dimensions of social space are the social and the physical distance separating people (Levine, Carter and Gorman 1976). Simmel used these two dimensions to identify social types. For example, he discussed the "stranger" as being physically close, but socially distant:

> In the case of the stranger, the union of closeness and remoteness involved in every human relationship is patterned in a way that may be succinctly formulated as follows: the distance within this relation indicates that one who is close by is remote, but his strangeness indicates that one who is remote is near (Simmel 1971, p. 143).

The dimension of physical distance is quite easily interpreted, but that of social distance deserves discussion. Levine, Carter and Gorman (1976a) have discussed the variety of ways in which Simmel's use of social distance has been interpreted, including: the lack of understanding between members of different groups (Bogardus 1925), the invisible territory surrounding a person which others may not enter (Goffman 1959), and dissimilarities among people (McFarland and Brown 1973). Others have viewed social space as multidimensional (Westie 1952,1953, Poole 1927, Kadushin 1962).

Most of the work on the social distance between friends has focused on similarities between friends. The extent to which friends are similar has been discussed or researched in terms of social status (Laumann 1973), values (Laumann 1973, Williams 1956,1959, Lazarsfeld and Merton 1954), and personality (Albert and Brigante 1962, Coelho 1959, Izard 1960, 1963). Although this approach has been quite useful, I will focus here on the

subjective aspect of social distance that involves the degree of emotional closeness felt between people. My interpretation is similar to the concept of personal distance discussed by Kadushin (1962):

> Personal distance or empathy is the degree of understanding and unspoken communcation that takes place between two persons or two statuses--what Simmel had in mind when he wrote of "personal" relationships (p. 520).

I choose to use the term emotional closeness rather than personal distance for two related reasons. First, in every day speech one often hears a relationship described as a "close" one. People rarely describe relationships in terms of the amount of emotional distance that separates people, and frequently describe relationships in terms of the closeness that ties them to one another instead. Second, I argue below that people equate emotional closeness and the notions of empathy and understanding Kadushin mentioned.

One could thus construct a typology of relationships in which the categories are described by the degree of emotional closeness felt between people and the amount of physical distance separating them. Simmel's stranger would be described as physically close and emotionally distant. Using this classification system, Cooley might have described primary relationships as emotionally and physically close.

Compared to the full spectrum of relationships, primary ones are emotionally closer. Yet they still vary within a range. On the dimension of physical distance, primary relationships can exist at any point. This is facilitated by modern communications technology such as the telephone, but was possible beforehand through letters (Faris 1932). It is quite common now to have one's family and friends spread all over the country.

Using both dimensions, physical distance and emotional closeness, one can identify different types of friendship much in the same way Simmel identified types of relationships in general. Friends can be (1) emotionally

close and live nearby, (2) emotionally more distant and live nearby, (3) emotionally close and live far away, or (4) emotionally and physically distant. Of course, the dimensions are theoretically continuous, so one could identify an infinite number of types of friendship.

This paper explores both dimensions of social space, emotional closeness and physical distance, as they relate to friendship. I look at the range in emotional closeness of friendships, what it means to be close to somebody, and how this differs across friendships. I also explore the dimension of physical distance. Afterwards, I look at the relationship between emotional closeness and physical distance among friends. Finally, I look at some of the consequences of different types of friendship and at some of the life cycle processes that contribute to the types of friendships an older person has.

Data and Methods

This paper is based on data from a 1980 study of seventy white, non-married, female senior citizens who lived in Oak Park, a middle-class suburb of Chicago. Oak Park has a large population of senior citizens. According to the 1980 Census, a fifth (21.8 percent) of its adult population (41,471) was sixty-two years or older. Over a quarter (26.3 percent) of its female adult innabitants (23,012) were sixty-two years or older (Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission 1981).

I found my respondents with the cooperation of several agencies and individuals who served the senior population in Oak Park, including the Township's Director of Senior Citizen Services, the women in charge of the Chore Service and Meals-on-Wheels, the Site Supervisor of the Nutrition Center, the Director of the Home Companion Service, the Social Director of a senior hotel, and two managers of senior apartment buildings. My sample is thus not necessarily representative of the non-married female senior citizens

in Oak Park. It includes only women who served other seniors or received services. It does include, however, women in a wide variety of situations. For example, the women in the sample had incomes that ranged from low to high, some were homebound and others were extremely active, and they ranged in age from sixty-two to ninety-one years. Some of them only had elementary school educations and others had professional degrees. Half of the women lived in age-segregated housing, and the rest lived elsewhere in the community. About two-thirds (65.7 percent) of the women were widows, a fifth (20.0 percent) had never been married, and the rest were divorced or separated.

I interviewed each respondent using a standard instrument which included both structured and unstructured questions. I tape recorded the interviews and kept detailed notes. After the first twenty interviews, I modified, added, and abandoned hypotheses. I changed the instrument, accordingly. I used a much shorter instrument for the last fifty interviews. The interviews took from a half an hour to seven hours (mean=141.7 minutes, s.d.=86.1 minutes). I also did some observations in the senior residences and at the Nutrition Center. I live in Oak Park and thus casually saw many of my respondents during and after the data collection process. I made notes on all of our encounters. I also saved newpaper clippings that mentioned any of my respondents.

In this paper, I use the answers to unstructured questions and observations to support quantitative analyses. In some cases, the respondent is the unit of analysis. In other cases, the dyadic friendship is the unit of analysis. ~~When the respondent is the unit of analysis,~~ I use a significance level of 0.10. ~~When the friendship is the unit of analysis, I use a significance level of 0.05.~~

The respondents named a total of 678 friends. I did not use an a priori definition of friendship. The first question I asked each respondent

was: "People have different ideas about what friendship is. How would you describe what a friendship is?" To help them clarify their definition of friendship, I asked: "How does this differ from an acquaintance?" In the first twenty interviews, I probed further by asking: "Some people think there are different kinds of friendship. How do you feel about this?" Once I was satisfied that the respondent had as clear as possible a definition of friendship in her mind, I asked: "Are there any people that you consider friends now?" and, if appropriate, "Could you please tell me the first names of the people you consider friends?" In this way the interview started with the respondent defining friendship for herself. I asked each respondent a set of questions about each friend and their relationship.

After having the respondent list her friends, I asked her about the relationship of each friend to each other friend. By quickly sketching a sociometric diagram, I identified friendship groups within her larger network. I asked her to choose one person from each group about whom she wished to talk at length. I refer to members of this smaller sample of 304 friends as "group representative friends." I automatically treated friends who were not friends with any of the respondent's other friends or whom the respondent named as her best friend as group representative friends. I asked a more detailed set of questions about each group representative friend than about each other friend.

Findings

Emotional Closeness

I asked the respondents about the emotional closeness they felt toward each of their friends: "Some friends feel closer to one another than others. Would you describe _____ as one of your closest friends, a close friend, or just a friend?" Of the 670 friends about whom the respondents answered this question, roughly a third fell into each category. I have further separated

the closest friendships into best and non-best friendships. See table 1 for the four category frequency distribution that results.

Respondents seemed to have distinguished between those friends who were among their closest and those who were not. To a somewhat lesser degree, respondents were able to distinguish further between those who were their close friends and those who were just their friends. In listing her friendships, one woman asked me:

> I think of my friends as surrounding me in concentric circles. Do you want me to name just my inner circle of friends, those I'm closest to, or those in the next larger circle, or those in the big circle?

This woman, who, incidentally, named a large number of friends when I told her to include all of them, expressed clearly that she thought of her friends as being unequally close to her. The ease with which she and the other respondents classified relationships suggests that the different levels of emotional closeness had real meaning for the respondents. It is this meaning I explore below.

The Meaning of Emotional Closeness

Intimacy and emotional closeness seemed to be indistinguishable for the respondents. There is both qualitative and quantitative evidence to support this statement. I asked the first twenty respondents: "Could you tell me what you would mean if you were to say that you feel close to someone?" Of the seventeen who answered the question almost all of them mentioned some aspect of intimacy such as confiding, trust, understanding, openess, and acceptance. Only about a tenth (11.8 percent) mentioned just a vague feeling without precisely discussing intimacy.

The connection between emotional closeness and intimacy was expressed by respondents in different ways. About three-fifths (58.9 percent) of them mentioned confiding behavior as a measure of closeness:

> It would mean I could confide in her, tell [her] personal things, trust her, tell her my past--

> Intimate talking-- You could converse and tell your side of the story and be able to understand their side. You could trust them.

These respondents often used words like trust, understanding, and openness. Others (29.4 percent) emphasized acceptance more than confiding:

> I would feel like I didn't have to look like a million dollars and they would accept you no matter what the mood.
>
> You have an easy feeling when you're around them. You don't have to weigh your words.

Each of these respondents was describing an intimate relationship, one in which a person does not have to put up an artificial front and can discuss her innermost thoughts. In Goffman's (1959) terms, the close friend is allowed "backstage."

In this study I used two measures of confiding behavior. First, I asked the respondents to name any people with whom they felt close enough to confide. Of the 675 friends about whom this question was asked, the respondents identified about a fifth (18.8 percent) of them as confidantes. About three-fifths (58.0 percent) of the sixty-nine respondents who answered this question named at least one friend as a confidante.

Second, I asked the following question about each of the group friendship representatives: "Now let's summarize how you feel about discussing things with _____. Which of the following comes closest to the way you feel? Do you feel free to discuss almost anything with _____, feel free to discuss some personal matters with _____, or only feel free to discuss things outside personal matters with _____? Of the 294 friends about whom respondents answered this question, respondents could discuss almost anything with two-fifths of them (42.9 percent) and some things with about a fifth (21.1 percent) of them. With the rest, they could only discuss things outside personal matters.

These measures were significantly related to one another[1], but were not identical. Of those friends about whom I asked both questions and in whom the respondents said they could confide (n=81), respondents could discuss almost anything with three-fifths (61.7 percent) of them, some things with a fifth (21.0 percent), and only things outside of personal matters with the rest. It is possible that some of the difference between these measures can be accounted for by social desirability. When I asked them if they had anyone in whom to confide, they may have felt pressured to name someone. It would be embarassing to admit that one was not close enough to confide in at least one person. Of course, many named relatives. When, on the other hand, I asked them about their tendency to talk to a specific friend about personal matters, the respondents may have felt freer to say they could not. Saying they did not talk to a specific friend about personal matters did not imply they had no one in whom to confide.

Both of these measures of confiding behavior are significantly related to emotional closeness.[2] In both cases, confiding behavior increases monotonically with emotional closeness (see tables 2 and 3). About half (48.9 percent) of the respondents' best friends were confidantes while only a few of the people (3.6 percent) who were just their friends were. The respondents could discuss almost any personal matter with about two-thirds (66.0 percent) of their best friends and with only about three-tenths (29.3 percent) of those who were just friends.

One must not jump to the conclusion that emotional closeness means that friends never irritate one another. There is no relationship between the emotional closeness of a relationship and the friend's tendency to irritate the respondent.[3] About a tenth (10.8 percent) of the group representative friends irritated the respondents often and another tenth (11.1 percent) irritated them sometimes. Although I did not ask what the irritating habits

were, many respondents volunteered the information. They complained of such things as their friends being bossy, tactless, gossipy, moody, unwilling to admit to a hearing problem, nervous, opinionated, forgetful, and talkative. One respondent complained that her friend had poor taste in television programs, and another complained that her friend always cut their conversations short. The respondents accepted their friends for what they were. Often they mentioned their friends knew their opinions. This acceptance and openness is another aspect of intimacy.

Physical Distance

Of the 678 friends named by the respondents, half (49.7 percent) lived in Oak Park, a quarter (23.7 percent) lived in Chicago or a suburb near Oak Park, and a quarter (26.5 percent) lived outside the immediate area. Most of the respondents' friends thus lived quite close to them. Of the 337 friends who lived in Oak Park, about two-fifths (43.9 percent) lived in the same building with the respondent. Of the 161 who lived elsewhere in the area, about two-fifths (45.3 percent) lived in a suburb adjacent to Oak Park such as River Forest, Elmwood Park, Forest Park, Berwyn, or Cicero. Another fifth (17.4 percent) lived in a non-adjacent, but nearby suburb.[4] The remaining two-fifths (37.3 percent) lived in Chicago. The distance separating a person who lives in Oak Park from a person living in Chicago can be less than that separating them from one who lives in a nearby suburb. Unfortunately the data are not broken down according to actual distance for those friends outside of Oak Park.

Of the 180 friends who lived outside the immediate Oak Park area, about two-fifths (43.3 percent) lived elsewhere in Illinois, a fifth (20.0 percent) lived in another mid-western state (Wisconsin, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North and South Dakota, Nebraska, or Kansas),

and about two-fifths (36.1 percent) lived in other regions of the United States. One friend lived outside of the country.

Working Definitions of Neighbor

When one thinks of the continuum from friends who live nearby to those who live far away, natural divisions do not come easily to mind. One distinction people do make is between neighbors and others. I asked the first twenty respondents: "When you consider someone a neighbor, what do you mean?" All but two of the respondents answered in terms of proximity. The two exceptions described neighbors as people who were dependable and available.

The size of the area in which people were considered neighbors varied from respondent to respondent and by residential context. Of those living in senior buildings, apartments, or condominiums (n=13), more than a fifth (23.1 percent) considered only those on their floors neighbors and about half (46.2 percent) considered only those in their buildings neighbors. Only a few also considered those in the next building (7.7 percent), on the rest of their block (15.4 percent), or in a wider area (7.7 percent) neighbors. In contrast, of those living in single-family dwellings (n=5), two-fifths considered everyone on their blocks neighbors, and three-fifths included those on the alley or the next block in their definitions.

While the people who lived in single-family dwellings probably interacted with fewer neighbors totally, the physical space in their "neighborhood" was larger. Those people in multiple-dwelling units, especially those in senior buildings, probably had more in common with their neighbors than those in houses did. Those in houses, however, were more likely to have lived there for a long time. On the average, house dwellers lived in their residences for about twenty-eight years (27.67 years) while occupants of multiple-dwelling units had lived there for an average of about

seven years (6.84 years). Although I have no formal evidence, the respondents living in houses seemed to be more likely than those in apartments to interact with neighbors of a variety of ages. The concept of neighbor thus potentially means very different things for older apartment dwellers than for older house dwellers.

Of the 189 friends the respondents named who lived outside their buildings in Oak Park, they considered about a fifth (22.2 percent) of them neighbors. These neighbor friends varied in how far they lived from the respondents. I asked the respondents for the addresses of each of their Oak Park friends. I then measured the distance in miles that each friend lived from the respondent and converted this to blocks using the ratio of eight blocks to a mile which is standard in Chicago. I was able to do these computations for 170 out of the 189 friends.[5] Although the trend is not monotonic, in general, the fewer blocks that separate a respondent from a friend, the more likely they were to consider the friend a neighbor.[6] The respondents considered as neighbors most (95.7 percent) of their friends who lived on the same block, about three-tenths (28.9 percent) of those who lived within one to four blocks, and about a fifth (18.8 percent) who lived within five or six blocks. They considered a few friends who lived beyond that point as neighbors, but none who lived as far as two miles away. If one includes those friends who lived in the same building with the respondent, almost all (96.3 percent) of the respondents' neighbor friends lived within a half mile of the respondents.

The Relationship between Emotional Closeness and Physical Distance

After exploring both of the dimensions of social space, emotional closeness and physical distance, one is left with the question: How are they related to one another? If one assumes that the classical interpretation of

primary group theory is correct and one needs face-to-face interaction to maintain intimate relationships, one would expect to find a negative relationship between physical distance and emotional closeness. In other words, one would expect that friends who lived near one another and thus could see one another more often would also be emotionally closer to one another. If, on the other hand, one assumes that frequent face-to-face contact is not important to maintain close relationships, one would expect to find no relationship between emotional closeness and physical distance.

The relationship that exists between emotional closeness and physical distance is contrary to both of these expectations: There is a positive relationship between them.[7] The farther away a person lived from the respondent, the more likely they were to be emotionally close to them (see table 4). About seven-tenths (70.2 percent) of the respondents' best friends and three-fifths (58.9 percent) of their closest ones lived outside Oak Park. On the other hand, over half of their close friends (54.0 percent) and those they considered just friends (56.8 percent) lived in Oak Park.

These findings are counter-intuitive. Frequency of interaction has often been discussed in the literature as a predictor of emotional closeness. The hypothesis that "persons who interact frequently with one another tend to like one another" was perhaps first considered in Homan"s (1950) study of the behavior of bank wiremen. He found support for the hypothesis, but qualified it by saying that it holds only when "other things are equal." Palisi's (1966) study of Italian-Americans in New York City also supported this hypothesis. He questioned the causal direction of his findings and suggested that people who already liked one another probably tended to interact more, so that the influences were reciprocal. In both cases, the correlation with emotional closeness would be positive. It would follow that living far apart would mean less frequent interaction and thus less emotional closeness. This is not the result I reported above.

The key to the dilemna is to be found in Homan's (1950) qualification that his hypothesis holds when other things are equal. What is not equal, in this case, is the durations of the friendships. Like frequency of interaction, duration has been suggested as a predictor of emotional closeness. Hess (1972) and Priest and Sawyer (1967) suggested that old friends may be the best friends. Goffman (1959) suggested that an enduring relationship is a prerequisite for intimacy. Lopata (1973) reported that of the widows in her metropolitan sample, eighty-eight percent of the black women and seventy-two percent of the white women agreed with the statement that old friends cannot be replaced. Hess (1972) suggested that this may be because of the experiences they have shared, the demonstrated acceptance of the person, or the friend's importance in contributing to the person's self image.

The counter-intuitive finding that physical distance and emotional closeness are positively correlated can be understood by exploring the average frequency of interaction and duration of relationships in each category of the social space typology. In addition to presenting those results below, I look at the relationships of duration and frequency of interaction with emotional closeness. A pattern emerges that is quite interesting.

Duration of Friendship

The respondents in this study agreed with the statement that old friends are the best friends. There is both qualitative and quantitative evidence to support this conclusion. I asked the first twenty repondents: "Some people feel that new friends are different from old friends. How do you feel about this?" Almost three-quarters (73.7 percent) of the nineteen respondents who answered the question indicated that old friends were better in some way. Only one person said new friends were closer than old ones. About a fifth (21.1 percent) did not choose one type of friend over the other.

Of these four people, three felt there was no difference between old friends and new friends, and one could not make the comparison because all of her old friends were dead.

Those who felt old friends were better than new friends felt that way for different reasons. Some felt it takes time before friendship gets firmly established:

> Old friends-- There is a treasure. You hesitate before you take new ones, because it takes time. The test is how they treat others.
>
> New friends are different. Time has lapsed in the older friends. Time takes care of things.
>
> An old friend is tried and true.... You are a little cautious with a newcomer. I'd like to see their background, work, and family associations--

Others felt old friends were closer:

> The old friends are closer in a way. When you're young you cling more. There is a feeling of closeness. Old friends are the best friends.
>
> New friends are not as close to you.

Two respondents felt that knowing one another well, as old friends do, was an advantage:

> They [new friends] don't know your good points or bad points and you don't know theirs. You feel free to discuss things and go places with old friends. You don't know the new person's preference.
>
> If you know people for a long time, you know their quirks and idiosyncrasies. It's like family.

Other respondents mentioned it was easier to confide in old friends:

> You don't have the same freedom [with new friends]. You wouldn't confide in them as [you would] those who have served the test of time.

One respondent felt old friends were more caring:

> Old friends are more interested in you and care more about you than new friends.

Two of others felt they were more dependable:

> You can rely on them and depend on them.
>
> An old time friend, even when they're far away, in a drastic emergency, could be called.

One should not make the mistake of assuming that old friends are more important than new friends to elderly women because they have difficulty making new ones. I asked the same respondents: "Some people are good at making new friends, some are more comfortable with people they have known a long time. How about you?" Only two of the nineteen respondents who answered the question said they had difficulty making new friends:

> I'm not too outgoing.
>
> I can't get out and make any new ones.

Another would have preferred old friends to new, but:

> When you're older you have to make new friends, because your old friends are dead.

The remaining sixteen respondents all found making new friends easy, but half of them added that old friends were special in some way:

> I feel more comfortable with old friends, but when people show they like me I can't help reciprocate.
>
> I don't find it difficult to make new friends. They may not be bosom buddies, but at least they're casual friends.

Some women quoted songs or old sayings:

> "Old pals are always the best pals you ever know, for new pals you meet every day."
>
> "Make new friends, but keep the old. One is silver and the other's gold."
>
> "New friends are many, but old friends are better than any."

One woman put it simply:

> I make new friends, but my old friends are better friends.

Duration of friendship is positively correlated with emotional closeness.[8] With one major exception, the average duration of the relationship tended to increase with emotional closeness within each category of physical distance (see table 5).[9] For example, considering those friends who lived outside Oak Park, but in the area, the respondents knew their best friends for an average of about fifty years and those who were just friends for about twenty years.

The one major departure from this pattern is the average duration of best friends who were neighbors. One would expect the average duration of best friendships among neighbors to have been longer than that of the closest friendships among neighbors, but it was not. A closer examination of the cases who were both best friends and neighbors of the respondent suggests why the trend does not hold. The trend does hold if one examines the average duration of friendships for the seven respondents who had neighbors as best friends. As one can see in table 5, the average duration for best friendships among neighbors was 6.14 years. For these same respondents, the average duration of their closest friendships was 3.50 years, for close friendships was 2.76 years, and for casual friendships was only 2.22 years. Six of the seven respondents who named best friends as neighbors lived in age-segregated housing. With one exception, the respondents had met these friends after moving in their building. Of those who met their best friend after moving into the building, three had never had a best friend before and two had had best friends before, but they had passed away. These women would not have named a best friend and perhaps no friends before they moved into age-segregated housing. Age-segregated housing had made friendship possible for these five women. Despite the deviant result, it seems fair to conclude that old friends are more likely to be among the closest friends, no matter how far away they live. In fact, duration explains the relationship between physical distance and emotional closeness.[10]

A skeptic might think these homages to old friends are a bit empty and that once friends are separated physically, with the passage of time, their closeness is forgotten. Looking at table 5, one sees that the average duration of the relationships increases with physical distance within each category of emotional closeness. As I suggested earlier, the closest friends tended to be the oldest friends, even though time has a way of geographically dispersing people.

In fairness to the skeptic, one must consider some of the forces that seemed to be operating in long-distance friendships. It is not suprising that people maintained long-distance relationships with their best and closest friends. It is a bit suprising that so many casual friendships were maintained over distance. Although I have no systematic evidence, many respondents said that these more casual friends had been closer when they lived near one another, but that distance had caused them to drift apart. Distance did cause a decrease in emotional closeness for some. One must also consider a possibility suggested by Hess (1972) that distance might serve a positive function, insulating people from changes in their friends. If this is true, some of the respondents might not have named some of their long-distance friends at all if they had lived closer to them.

Frequency of Interaction

As discussed earlier, the literature suggests that frequency of face-to-face interaction should be positively related to emotional closeness. In this sample, there is a tendency for this to be so, but it is not significant.[11] If one controls for physical distance, however, there is a significant tendency for frequency of interaction to increase with emotional closeness (see table 6).[12]

Once again, there is an exception. The trend would predict that the best friends who both lived in Oak Park would have seen one another more often on the average than the closest friends who lived in Oak Park. Here too, looking more closely at the seven cases in the deviant cell helps explain the departure from the trend. They also saw their other friends in Oak Park less frequently than was average. Some of the respondents lived in senior housing, and they were all fairly new residents. In their cases, senior housing did not necessarily enhance their friendships, but was beginning to pull them away

from old friends outside the building. Three of these four women lived in a building that required the residents to pay in advance for all lunches served in the cafeteria. All three of these women spontaneously mentioned the constraint this put on their social life outside the building. Two of the four women in senior housing were also making new friends in the building and said there was so much to do in the building that they lacked the motivation to leave. As I said, these women were relatively new residents. Perhaps in time, they will not have best friends. Two of them already had difficulty in deciding whether to name one or not.

In the three cases in which the respondents did not live in senior housing, they also had constraints on their socializing. One of the respondents was one of the seven women in the sample who still worked part-time. She mentioned that she would have seen her friends more often if she had not been so busy. The remaining respondents represented two of the five home bound ones in the sample. Both of them gave definitions of friendship that emphasized dependability, and both of them named best friends who helped them more than their other friends. One of these best friends had originally been paid to help the respondent and the other belonged to the respondent's church. In both cases, the respondents expressed the desire to see their best friends more often, but could not initiate visits themselves.

Two Roads Toward Friendship

Since duration has been shown to be a positive predictor of emotional closeness and since frequency of interaction is also a positive predictor of emotional closeness when controlling for physical distance, one would expect them to be positively correlated, if at all. In this sample, they are negatively correlated.[13] This relationship holds within each category of physical distance.[14] This suggests that there are two distinct reasons the

respondents considered people very close friends: Their relationship with the friend was an enduring one or they saw the respondent often. Both could be aspects of the same phenomenon; perhaps one must interact with someone a certain amount before being on intimate terms. This is consistent with Hess's(1972) observation that frequency of visiting among new friends is correlated with intimacy, but not among old friends. Proximity would thus be important in the early stages of a relationship, but not after it was firmly established.

The Social Space Typology

Using Simmel's approach to the study of social relationships, one can divide friendships into those that are: (1) emotionally and physically close, (2) emotionally distant and physically close, (3) emotionally close and physically distant, and (4) emotionally and physically distant. This typology of friendship seems useful because it tells us something about the friendships under study. In table 7, I have collapsed the sixteen category typology presented in tables 4, 5, and 6 into four quadrants. I have collapsed the categories of the best and closest friends of the respondents into emotionally close friends and the categories of close friends and those who were just friends into emotionally distant ones. All local friends are categorized as physically close ones, and all non-local ones as physically distant ones. I have also provided summaries of the measures of duration and frequency of interaction for each quadrant in table 7. The emotionally closest friendships were most likely to fall into the third quadrant and the emotionally more distant ones were most likely to fall into the second quadrant.[13] This means that the respondents closest and oldest friends tended to live far from them and that they saw them relatively infrequently. The friends who lived near them tended to be their newest, most casual friends, but they saw them relatively often.

Not all respondents had friends of each type (see table 8). Three respondents did not have any friends. Of the sixty-seven respondents who named at least one friend, about three-fifths (58.2 percent) had at least one emotionally close friend living in Oak Park, about three-quarters (74.6 percent) had at least one emotionally distant friend living in Oak Park, about four-fifths (79.1 percent) had at least one emotionally close friend living elsewhere, and about seven-tenths (70.1 percent) had at least one emotionally distant friend living elsewhere. Over nine-tenths (92.5 percent) had at least one emotionally close friend, and almost that many (86.6 percent) had at least one friend living in Oak Park.

Help from Friends of Different Types

The majority of the respondents received help from friends with at least one of the ten tasks about which I asked them (see table 9). Of the seventy respondents, including the three who mentioned no friends, about two-thirds (67.1 percent) had at least one friend who helped them. Respondents received help from friends, in order of decreasing frequency: with transportation (45.7 percent), during sickness (27.1 percent), with shopping or errands (25.7 percent), with fixing things around their home (15.7 percent), in emergencies other than sickness (14.3 percent), in the form of advice on money matters (12.9 percent), in the form of a gift or loan of money (8.5 percent), in making important decisions (8.5 percent), with housekeeping (4.3 percent), and with cooking (2.9 percent). Of course, not all of the respondents needed or wanted help in these areas.

In general, emotionally close friends were more likely to help the respondents, regardless of the physical distance separating them (see table 10).[14] Of the forty-seven best friends named, about two-fifths (40.4 percent) helped the respondent with at least one of the ten tasks. This is in contrast

to a fifth of both the people described as being among the respondents' closest friends (22.0 percent) and the people described as the respondents' close friends (21.0 percent) and to a tenth (12.0 percent) of those described as just friends by the respondents.

Emotional closeness was important for the performance of each of the ten tasks, regardless of the physical distance separating the friends, with two exceptions.[17] The two exceptions are help with housekeeping and loaning or giving the respondent money. Friends rarely helped the respondents in these two ways, so there were really not sufficient cases to say conclusively that emotional closeness did not matter.

The amount of physical distance separating friends also had an important impact on their helping behavior (see table 10). Although the trend is not monotonic, physical distance was negatively related to helping behavior, regardless of the emotional closeness between the friends and respondents.[18] About a fifth (19.5 percent) of the 190 neighbor friends helped one of the respondents. Only a few (6.1 percent) of the friends who lived outside the Oak Park area helped one of them.

Physical distance made it less likely that friends helped the respondents with each of the ten tasks, regardless of the emotional closeness bringing them together, with three exceptions.[19] The exceptions were help with housekeeping, cooking, and decision making. As I mentioned above, there are not enough cases to look closely at the effects on help with housekeeping. One might have expected the friends who lived near the respondents to be more likely to help with cooking. The respondents mentioned, however, that most of the help they received with cooking was when their friends were guests. Both local and non-local friends visited the respondents. Help with decision-making can be offered on the telephone or through letters, as well as in person.

In summary, friends were more likely to help the respondents with most tasks if they were emotionally close to them and lived near them. This makes the friendships in the first quadrant of the social space typology the most crucial in understanding the help respondents received from friends.

Types of Friendship and Psychological Well-being

The question remains, what is the effect of different types of friendship on the older woman's psychological well-being? I included the questions used to construct Bradburn's (1969) affect balance measure. In general, the more friends a person had, the higher their affect balance was.[20]

Bradburn's (1969) affect balance scale consists of ten questions representing two independent dimensions which measure positive and negative affect. Negative affect was not significantly related to the numbers of any of the four types of friends when the total size of the network was considered.[21] When controlling on the total number of friends, the number of emotionally close friends who lived in Oak Park was positively correlated with positive affect when controlling for the total number of friends named.[22] The correlation between the number of emotionally close, local friendships and positive affect was explained by controlling for an estimate of the respondent's frequency of interaction with all friends in a year.[23] When controlling on the total size of the network, the number of emotionally distant, non-local friends is negatively correlated with positive affect[24] This correlation is explained by controlling for the respondent's frequency of interaction with all friends in a year.[25] The numbers of each of the remaining two types of friends were not significantly related to positive affect, when controlling on the total number of friends named.[26] In summary, the respondents' psychological

well-being was only improved by contact with emotionally close friends, and, because they were close enough to see the respondents, emotionally close, local friends made them feel good. They did not, however, prevent them from experiencing negative affect.

Life Cycle Processes Affecting the Number of Emotionally Close, Local Friends

Emotionally close, local friends were thus most likely to help the respondent and to improve her psychological well-being. As mentioned before, only about three-fifths (58.2 percent) of the respondents who named at least one friend, named at least one emotionally close, local one. The crucial question becomes: Which older women were likely to have friends of this type, and which were not?

None of the women in this study were married. The most obvious difference in their current situation was the type of residence in which they lived. Half of them lived in age-segregated housing, and half of them did not. The women who lived in age-segregated housing did not tend to name more friends than women who lived elsewhere,[27] but they did tend to name more emotionally close, local ones.[28] This was true even when controlling for the total number of friends named.[29] On the average, the thirty-four women in age-segregated housing who named at least one friend, had 1.59 emotionally close friends in Oak Park. On the average, the thirty-three women who lived elsewhere in the community and named at least one friend had less than one (0.939) emotionally close, local friend. This suggests that either people in age-segregated housing had different definitions of close friendship or that they tended to have different types of friendships. In either case, it is important to explore the life cycle processes that influenced the two aggregates of women separately.

I explored the effects on the number of emotionally close, local friendships of work history, heal tatus, residential history, and marital status. Residential history affected the number of emotionally close, local friendships in both age-segregated situations and elsewhere. Marital status influenced the number of emotionally close, local friendships in age-segregated settings only. Work history and health status did not significantly affect the number of emotionally close, local friendships in either kind of setting.

The effects of residential history were different in age-segregated settings than elsewhere in the community. In age-segregated settings, the number of moves the respondent had made in the last twenty years was negatively correlated with the number of emotionally close, local friends named, regardless of the total number of friends named.[30] Elsewhere in the community the comparable correlation was positive.[31] In age-segregated housing the correlation is explained by length of Oak Park residence.[32] In other words, those who moved a lot were not as likely to have lived in Oak Park long, and thus were less likely to have many emotionally close, local friends.

In the case of those living elsewhere in the community, I have no evidence about the process that explains the positive correlation between number of moves in the last twenty years and number of emotionally close, local friends, just a suspicion. It could be that the women who moved often in their later years became good at developing new emotionally close friendships in new residential settings out of necessity. Those who stayed behind in their old neighborhoods may not have had the same motivation to make new friends. Over time, many of the emotionally close, local friends of those who stayed behind may have relocated, becoming physically distant friends. The question that remains, is: Why was there no similar effect among women in

age-segregated housing? The women in age-segregated housing tended to have moved more in the last twenty years than those living elsewhere in the community.[33] On the average, the thirty-five women in age-segregated housing had moved about three times (X=3.09, s.d.=1.87). About four-fifths (82.9 percent) had moved twice or more in the last twenty years. The thirty-five who lived elsewhere in the community had only moved an average of about once in the last twenty years (X=1.20, s.d.=1.28). Almost a third (31.4 percent) had not moved at all. One could argue that almost all of the women in age-segregated housing had had the opportunity to develop their skills at making new friends, while many fewer of the women who lived in the community had. This would explain the difference in results for those women in age-segregated settings and those elsewhere in the community.

A similar arguement can be made to explain why marital status made a difference in the number of emotionally close, local friendships in age-integrated settings, but not in age-segregated ones. In age-integrated settings, widows had significantly more emotionally close, local friends than other women, regardless of the total number of friends they named.[34] Women who had never been married had significantly fewer emotionally close, local friends than other women, regardless of the total number of friends they named.[35] This took them away from their homes, and possibly Oak Park, each day. Once again, this suggests that women in age-integrated settings were more affected by their past patterns of interaction than women in age-segregated settings. Single women in age-integrated settings were more likely to have worked most of their lives[36] and to have supported themselves than women who had been married.[37] I suspect that their close friends were more likely to live outside the local community than those of women who were married. In other words, they had a more cosmopolitan approach to friendship. Women who had been married, on the other hand, probably made their friends

close to home. This pattern, if one assumes it was a life-long one, persisted for those women who still lived in age-integrated settings. Among the widowed women who lived in age-integrated settings, an average of a third (32.5 percent) of their emotionally close friends lived in Oak Park. This is in contrast to an average of less than a tenth (7.6 percent) of the emotionally close friends of single women in age-integrated settings. Age-segregated housing seems to have disrupted these old patterns. Women began to recognize the similarities in their conditions. As one respondent who lived in senior housing put it:

We're all in the same boat.

The differences between women with different marital histories were thus equalized in age-segregated settings.

Conclusions

Most researchers, by using an a priori definition of friendship, have studied only some sub-types of it. This has been misleading. For example, focusing only on friends the respondent had seen recently has left the impression that older people do not have many non-local friends, because one does not see long-distant friends often. The women in this sample almost all had friends outside of Oak Park. Often the people whom the respondent had seen recently or most often were not their closest, most intimate friends. By ignoring the variation in the emotional closeness that characterizes friendships, this is missed.

There were essentially two roads toward close friendship. Close friends were either those the respondents had seen often or had known a long time. As suggested earlier, perhaps face-to-face interaction is important in the early stages of a friendship, but not after it is firmly established.

Friends helped the respondent in many ways, but not all types of friendships yielded the same rewards. Emotionally close, local friends were more likely to help the respondents with most tasks than other friends. A significant exception to this was help with decision-making which was equally likely to be provided by local and non-local friends. Frequent interaction with friends improved the respondents' psychological well-being. Since the respondents tended to see emotionally close, local friends most often, they also became crucial in this regard. While old, non-local friends were most often seen by the respondents as their best and most intimate friends, they were not the respondents' most important helpers or mOSt important for the respondents' psychological well-being.

Only about three-fifths of the respondents had emotionally close, local friends. In the future, I will explore the importance of other types of friendships for those who lacked emotionally close, local ones. Perhaps in the absence of emotionally close, local friends, casual, local friends and emotionalLY close, non-local friends become more important helpers and more important for psychological well-being.

The findings also suggest that moving to age-segregated housing caused a disruption of old friendship patterns, but that this disruption may not have been undesirable. Women in age-segregated housing had more emotionally close, local friendships than those elsewhere in the community. I have suggested this may be because people elsewhere in the community had been left behind as old friends moved or died, and that they had not been motivated to replace them. A move to age-segregated housing seems to have provided the motivation and the opportunity to make new friends. Past statuses, such as marital history, did not seem to be as salient in the age-segregated settings. Women in age-segregated settings emphasized the similarities of their conditions rather than the differences.

Footnotes

1. χ^2=19.88, df=2, p<.01, n=293.

2. For confiding behavior by emotional closeness: χ^2=88.82, df=3, p<.01, n=667. For tendency to discuss personal matters by emotional closeness: χ^2=25.12, df=6, p.01, n=292.

3. χ^2=9.27, df=6, p>.15, n=297

4. I considered a suburb nearby if it was listed as being within the toll-free calling area for Oak Park in the 1981 Illinois Telephone Directory, but was not adjacent to Oak Park. This group included River Grove, North Lake, Stone Park, Melrose Park, Berkely, Bellwood, Maywood, Hillside, Westchester, Broadview, Stickney, and Forest View. These suburbs are all within a half hour's drive of Oak Park.

5. Of the nineteen missing cases, the respondents could remember only the street for seven of them, and could not remember the address at all for eleven of them. I failed to ask the address of the remaining friend.

6. χ^2=81.78, df=5, p<.01, n=170.

7. Pearson's r=.1625, p<.01, n=670. See table 4 for the categories of emotional closeness and physical distance.

8. Pearson's r=.2853, p<.01, n=647.

9. Pearson's r within categories of physical distance: (1) neighbors r=.0333, p>.33, n=174; (2) Oak Park r=.1792, p<.05, n=141; (3) In area r=.4430, p<.01, n=154; and (4) Elsewhere r=.2493, p<.01, n=178.

10. Controlling for duration, the correlation between emotional closeness and physical distance is: r=-.0163, p<.01, n=638.

11. I asked the respondents when they last saw each of their friends and, depending on which was appropriate, how many times they had seen them in the last week, month, or year. I then multiplied the number of times they had seen their friends in the last week by fifty-two or in the last month by twelve to get an estimate of the frequency of interaction in a year. If they had not seen their friends in over a year, the frequency was coded as zero. Pearson's r=.0125, p>.37, n=654.

12. Pearson's r within categories of physical distance: (1) neighbors r=.2285, p<.01, n=182; (2) Oak Park r=.0567, p>.25, n=144; (3) In area r=.1635, p<.05, n=153; and (4) Elsewhere r=.1025, p<.10, n=177. Controlling for physical distance, the correlation between emotional closeness and frequency of interaction is: r=.1359, p<.01, n=6653

13. Pearson's r=-.4776, p<.01, n=641.

14. Pearson's r within categories of physical distance: (1) neighbors r=-.4630, p<.01, n=173; (2) Oak Park r=-.2641, p<.01, n=140; (3) In area r=-.1857, p<.05, n=153; and (4) Elsewhere r=.-2446, p<.01, n=177. Controlling for physical distance, the correlation between frequency of interaction and duration is: r=-.2308, p<.01, n=6640

15. Maximum likelihood χ^2=17.03, df=1, p<.01, n=670. This means that the independence model does not fit the data. Since it is a two by two table there is only one informative effect: λ=-.171. This means that friends were less likely to be emotionally close if they lived near by. The standard error (se) is .042, so the standard normal variate is -.171/.042=4.07, which has a probability of less than .05. This means the effect of physical distance on emotional closeness was not likely to be due to chance.

16. Partial r=0.1964, p<.01, df=667.

17. The partial correlations for emotional closeness with the performance of each task, controlled for physical distance are: sickness r=0.1683, p<.01; other emergencies r=0.1142, p<.01; advice on money matters r=0.0819, p<.05; shopping or running errands r=0.0789, p<.05; fixing things r=0.0672, p<.05; housekeeping r=-0.0035, p>.46; loan or gift of money r=0.0484, p>.10; transportation r=0.1186, p<.01; cooking r=0.0895, p<.01; and decision making r=0.1228, p<.01. There are 667 degrees of freedom for each partial correlation.

18. Partial r=-0.1708, p<.01, df=667.

19. The partial correlations for physical distance with the performance of each task, controlled for emotional closeness are: sickness r=-0.0778, p<.05; other emergencies r=-0.0551, p<.10; advice on money matters r=-0.0539, p<.10; shopping or running errands r=-0.1222, p<.01; fixing things r=-0.0764, p<.05; housekeeping r=0.0107, p>.39; loan or gift of money r=-0.0534, p<.10; transportation r=-0.0934, p<.01; cooking r=-0.0373, p>.16; and decision making r=-0.0253, p>.25. There are 667 degrees of freedom for each partial correlation.

20. Pearson's r=0.2248, p<.05, n=70.

21. The partial correlations for negative affect by the number of each type of friendship, controlled for the total number of friends named are: emotionally close, local r=-0.0273, p>.41; emotionally distant, local r=-0.0254, p>.41; emotionally close, non-local r=0.0416, p>.36; emotionally distant, non-local r=0.0023, p>.49. There are 67 degrees of freedom for each partial correlation.

22. Partial r=0.1763, p<.10, df=67.

23. Partial r=0.0659, p>.29, df=67.

24. Partial r=-0.2721, p<.05, df=67.

25. Partial r=-0.1121,p>.18, df=67.

26. The partial correlations for positive affect by the number of each of the two remaining types of friendship, controlled by the total number of friends named are: emotionally distant, local r=0.1554, p>.10, df=67 and emotionally close, non-local r=-0.0425, p>.36, df=67.

27. Pearson's r=-0.1415, p>.12, n=70.

28. Pearson's r=0.1881, p<.10, n=67.

29. Partial r=0.2466, p<.05, df=64.

30. Partia r=-0.2818, p<.10, df=31.

31. Partial r=0.3907, p<.05, df=30.

32. Partial r=-0.1249, p>.25, df=29.

33. Pearson's r=0.5129, p<.01, n=70.

34. Partial r=0.3298, p<.05, df=30.

35. Partial r=-0.3141, p<.05, df=30.

36. Pearson's r=0.2694, p<.10, df=33.

37. Pearson's r=0.4015, p<.01, df=33.

Bibliography

Albert, R.S. and T.R. Brigante
1962 "The psychology of friendship relations: social factors." Journal of Social Psychology 56:33-47.

Bogardus, Emory S.
1959 Social Distance. Yellow Springs, Ohio: Antioch.

Bradburn, Norman
1969 Structure of Psychological Well-being. Chicago:Aldine

Cantor, Marjorie H.
1979 "Neighbors and friends." Research on Aging 1(4 Dec.):434-63.

Coelho, George V.
1959 "A guide to the literature of friendship: a selectively annotated bibliography." Psychology Newsletter 10:365-94.

Cohen, Carl I. and Rajkowski, Henry.
1982 "What's in a friend? Substantive and theoretical issues." The Gerontologist 22(3):261-66.

Crowe, Patricia W.
1978 Good fences make good neighbors: social networks at three levels of urbanization in Tirol, Austria. PhD Dissertation, Stanford University.

Dotson, Floyd
1951 "Patterns of voluntary associations among urban working class families." American Sociological Review 16(Oct.):687-93.

Faris, Ellsworth
1932 "The primary group: essence and accident." American Journal of Sociology 37:41-50.

Goffman, Erving
1959 The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Goldman, Stanford
1971 "Social aging, disorganization, and the loss of choice." The Gerontologist 11(2, Part I):158-62.

Hess, Beth
1972 "Friendship." Pp.357-93 in M.W. Riley, M. Johnson, and A. Foner (eds.), Aging and Society: A Sociology of Age Stratfication, Vol. 3. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Hochschild, Arlie R.
1973 The Unexpected Community. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Homans, George C.
1950 The Human Group. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.

Izard, C. E.
1960 "Personality similarity and friendship." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 61:47-51.
1963 "Personality similarity and friendship: a follow-up study." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 66(6):598-600.

Jacobson, David
1968 "Friendship and mobility in the development of an urban elite African social system." Southwestern Journal of Anthropology 24(2 Summer): 123-38.

Kadushin, Charles
1962 "Social distance between client and professional." American Journal of Sociology 67(5):517-31.

Laumann, Edward O.
1973 Bonds of Pluralism: the Form and Substance of Urban Social Networks. New York:John Wiley and Sons.

Lazarsfeld, P.F. and R.K. Merton
1954 "Friendship as social process: a substantive and methodological analysis." Pp. 18-66 in M. Berger (ed.), Freedom and Control in Modern Society. New York: Van Nostrum.

Levine, Donald N., Ellwood B. Carter and Eleanor Miller Gorman
1976 "Simmel's influence on American sociology I." American Journal of Sociology 81(4 Jan.):813-845.

Lopata, Helena Z.
1973 "Social relations of black and white widowed women in a northern metropolis." American Journal of Sociology 78:1003-10.
1979 Women as Widows. New York: Elsevier.

McFarland, David and Daniel Brown
1973 "Social distance as a metric: a systematic introduction to smallest space analysis." Pp. 213-53 in Edward O. Laumann, Bonds of Pluralism: The Form and Substance of Urban Social Networks. New York: Wiley and Sons.

Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission
1981 "1980 census: tables on Oak Park, Illinois." Unpublished.

Palisi, Bartolomeo J.
1966 "Ethnic patterns of friendship." Phylon 27(3 Fall):217-25.

Poole, Willard C.
1927 "Distance in sociology." American Journal of Sociology 33(1):99-104.

Priest, R.F. and Jack Sawyer
1967 "Proximity and peership: bases of balance in interpersonal attraction." American Journal of Sociology 72:633-49.

Rosenberg, George S.
1970 The Worker Grows Old. San Francisco, California:Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Rosow, Irving
1967 Social Integration of the Aged. New York: The Free Press.

Simmel, Georg
1971 On Individuality and Social Forms. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.

Westie, Frank R.
1952 "Negro-white status differentials and social distance." American Sociological Review 17(Oct.):550-58.
1953 "A technique for the measurement of race attitudes." American Sociological Review 18(Feb.):73-78.

Williams, Robin
1956 Friendship and Social Values: A Working Report from the Summer Seminar in Behavioral Science Research. University of Oregon.
1959 "Friendship and social values in a suburban community." Pacific Sociological Review 2:3-10.

Table 1

Frequency Distribution of Emotional Closeness of Friends

Emotional Closeness	Frequency	Percent
Best friend	47	7.0
Closest friends	173	25.8
Close friends	200	29.9
Just friends	250	37.3
Total	670	100.0

Table 2

Emotional Closeness by Confiding Behavior

Emotional Closeness	Percent Who Confide	Total
Best friend	48.9	47
Closest friends	33.5	173
Close friends	18.5	200
Just friends	3.6	247
Total	19.0	667

Table 3

Emotional Closeness by Tendency to Discuss Personal Matters

Emotional Closeness	% Any Personal	% Some Personal	% Outside Personal	Total
Best friend	66.0	12.8	21.3	47
Closest friends	53.8	20.0	26.3	80
Close friends	34.2	26.0	39.7	73
Just friends	29.3	21.7	48.9	92
Total	43.2	20.9	35.9	292

Table 4

Physcial Distance by Emotional Closeness

Physical Distance	Emotional Closeness									
	Best		Closest		Close		Just		Total	
	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.
Neighbors	14.9	7	20.8	36	31.0	62	34.0	85	28.4	190
Others in Oak Park	14.9	7	20.2	35	23.0	46	22.8	57	21.6	145
In area	34.0	16	25.4	44	23.0	46	20.0	50	23.3	156
Elsewhere	36.2	17	33.5	58	23.0	46	23.2	58	26.7	179
Total	100.0	47	99.9	173	100.0	200	100.0	250	100.0	670

Table 5

Average Number of Years of Friendship within Each Cell of the Crosstabulation of Physical Distance by Emotional Closeness

Physical Distance		Emotional Closeness				
		Best	Closest	Close	Just	Total
Neighbors	$\bar{X}$	6.14	10.43	9.49	8.37	9.09
	s.d.	6.20	12.29	11.65	11.07	11.34
	n	7	35	61	71	174
Others in Oak Park	$\bar{X}$	25.57	22.00	18.16	16.22	18.70
	s.d.	17.75	15.54	12.66	15.98	15.06
	n	7	34	45	55	141
In area	$\bar{X}$	50.63	31.36	19.48	20.06	26.29
	s.d.	22.65	18.44	14.88	14.78	19.33
	n	16	44	46	48	154
Elsewhere	$\bar{X}$	46.82	44.28	31.59	34.07	37.97
	s.d.	19.22	21.41	16.44	19.66	20.20
	n	17	58	46	57	178
Total	$\bar{X}$	38.89	29.60	18.91	19.01	23.22
	s.d.	24.56	21.87	15.96	18.15	20.11
	n	47	171	198	231	647

Table 6

Average Number of Interactions per Year within Each Cell of the Crosstabulation of Physical Distance by Emotional Closeness

Physical Distance		Emotional Closeness				
		Best	Closest	Close	Just	Total
Neighbors	$\bar{X}$	260.00	258.67	188.68	171.77	198.11
	s.d.	134.26	138.88	126.34	146.30	141.06
	n	7	36	62	77	182
Others in Oak Park	$\bar{X}$	46.57	75.77	52.61	56.21	59.20
	s.d.	33.16	85.87	63.28	81.59	75.53
	n	7	34	46	57	144
In area	$\bar{X}$	44.81	34.30	32.39	18.68	30.03
	s.d.	60.90	49.19	58.76	26.05	48.45
	n	16	44	46	47	153
Elsewhere	$\bar{X}$	23.82	16.95	15.02	9.70	14.77
	s.d.	66.65	48.96	21.84	30.66	40.07
	n	17	57	46	57	177
Total	$\bar{X}$	69.53	83.99	81.50	75.05	78.95
	s.d.	108.79	124.20	109.72	116.50	115.86
	n	47	171	200	238	656

Table 7

Average Duration in Years and Average Frequency of Interaction per Year within Quadrants of the Social Space Typology

Physical Distance	Emotional Closeness: Close	Emotional Closeness: Distant
Close	(1) Highest Frequency: 167.1 Low Duration: 16.1	(2) High Frequency: 126.2 Lowest Duration: 12.4
Distant	(3) Low Frequency: 26.8 Highest Duration: 41.1	(4) Lowest Frequency: 18.4 High Duration 31.1

Table 8

Percentage of the Sixty-seven Respondents Who Named at Least One Friend Who Named at Least One Friend within Each Cell of the Social Space Typology

Physical Distance	Emotional Closeness: Close	Emotional Closeness: Distant	Total
Close	58.2%	74.6%	86.6%
Distant	79.1%	70.1%	92.5%
Total	92.5%	88.1%	100.0%

Table 9

Percentage of the Seventy Respondents Receiving Help from at Least One Friend with Each Task

Task	Percent
Transportation	45.7
Sickness	27.1
Shopping or Errands	25.7
Fixing Things	15.7
Emergencies	14.3
Advice on Finances	12.9
Gift or Loan of Money	8.5
Decision-making	8.5
Housekeeping	4.3
Cooking	2.9
Any One Task	67.1

Table 10

Percentage of Respondents Receiving Help within Each Cell of the Crosstabulation of Physical Distance by Emotional Closeness

Physical Distance		Emotional Closeness				
		Best	Closest	Close	Just	Total
Neighbors	%	57.1	22.2	22.6	12.9	19.5
	n	7	36	62	85	190
Others in Oak Park	%	85.7	34.3	37.0	19.3	31.7
	n	7	35	46	57	145
In area	%	37.5	27.3	21.7	14.0	22.4
	n	16	44	46	50	156
Elsewhere	%	17.6	10.3	2.2	1.7	6.1
	n	17	58	46	58	179
Total	%	40.4	22.0	21.0	12.0	100.0
	n	47	173	200	250	670